DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 367 SO 000 477

AUTHOR	Anderson, Lee F.
TITLE	What Contributions Can and Should the Schools Make to the International Education of Children and Young People?
INSTITUTION	Foreign Policy Association, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[68]
NOTE	57p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Citizenship; *Cross Cultural Training; Cultural Awareness; *Curriculum Development; Elementary Grades; Foreign Culture; Foreign Relations; Fundamental Concepts; Humanism; *International Education; Models; School Role; Secondary Grades; Social Studies; *World Affairs
IDENTIFIERS	*Worldmindedness

ABSTRACT

In the initial part of this essay, the author attempts to summarize major "objects" of international understanding. First, in its broadest sense international understanding might be taken to mean an understanding of the world system. Second, it is useful to view the schools as being able to make three primary contributions to students' understanding of this world system--an understanding of: the earth as a planet; mankind as a species of life; and the global social system as one level of human social organization. Third, a summary is offered of what there is about the planet, species, and international social system that educators and social scientists feel should be emphasized. The concept of international understanding also points toward certain qualities, characteristics, or capacities to be developed in individuals (referred to as "dimensions" of international understanding). In the second portion of the essay, the author attempts to deal with the question of what distinguishes the internationally competent citizen. After suggesting that individuals occupy six major kinds of roles in relation to the world system, an attempt is made to specify for each role the major characteristics that distinguish the internationally competent citizen. Finally, a summary of the essay is presented in the form of a typology, which sets forth major contributions that the K-12 curriculum should seek to make to students' international understanding. (Author/JLB)

ED 065367

SO 000 477

50

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

WHAT CONTRIBUTIONS CAN AND SHOULD THE SCHOOLS MAKE TO THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE? *

Lee F. Anderson
Department of Political Science and
School of Education
Northwestern University

I

INTRODUCTION

The concern of this essay is summarized in the question that forms its title. Or to put the issue a bit differently, what ought we consider to be the primary objective of the K-12 curriculum in respect to international education?

Traditionally, we have answered this question in a general way by saying that the schools should count among their major educational goals the development of students' international or world understanding. What does this mean? When as teachers or the developers of curriculum we are instructed to promote students' international understanding, what are we being asked to do?

Unfortunately, we have never been entirely clear about this. While countless curriculum guides and a rather massive volume of commentary on school curriculum refer to education for international understanding and note the importance of such education given the likely shape of the world that today's students will inherit from their elders, rarely do we specify with any conceptual precision what it is that we have in mind by "international understanding." Indeed a review of the literature on education for international understanding reveals a good deal of ambiguity, uncertainty, and conflict about the nature of such education.(1)

That we should suffer the absence of a clear and precise conception of the objectives that schools should seek to realize in their reaching about world affairs is regretable, but it is also

---

* This paper is based on ideas developed in a Foreign Policy Association study, "Objectives, Needs, and Priorities in International Education." This study was supported by the U.S. Office of Education. The author was the coordinator of the study.

understandable. Vagueness, confusion, and uncertainty about basic objectives are characteristic of organizations as well as individuals who are caught up in rapid and extensive socio-cultural change, and this is certainly the lot of the modern school. American schools are simultaneously experiencing many of the first and second-order consequences of those "revolutions" and "explosions" that have become modern man's daily companions. The revolution in science and technology, the moral revolution, the revolution in the behavioral sciences, the Black revolt, the knowledge explosion -- all of these characteristic forces of our time touch the operations of the schools.

In principle, the dynamics of this process are simple. Socio-cultural change in the schools' organizational environment breeds new educational needs and wants as well as re-definitions and new formulations of the school's traditional concerns. Parents, universities and citizen groups as well as educators themselves transform these into demands upon the schools. Teachers, administrators, school boards, and curriculum developers are expected to convert these demands into decisions that create new courses of study, new teaching-learning materials, new ways of organizing the time and work of students and teachers, etc.

In considering international education three demands are of particular relevance. First, the schools are being called upon to expand, indeed to globalize, the geographical focus of the curriculum, particularly social studies instruction. Traditionally, the schools have been looked to as organizational environments in which children and young people acquire many of the concepts, attitudes, values, skills and information which adults deem relevant to the task of making sense out of the physical and social environments students will occupy as adults. Today the psychologically salient environment of children and young people and certainly the sociologically relevant environment of tomorrow's adult citizens is planet-wide in scope and in fact is being gradually extended beyond the planet earth's traditional cosmic boundaries. Thus, in order to fulfill their traditional mission in social education of young people, the schools are expected to develop curriculum whose geographical focus is the world as a whole rather than just the United States or, somewhat more broadly, the northwestern region of the planet.

Second, the schools are expected to incorporate into their social studies programs substantially more of the concepts, analytical problems, and modes of inquiry characteristic of the new social sciences such as anthropology, sociology, political science, economics and social psychology. This demand, like the call for expanded geographical focus, represents an effort to adapt the school's traditional organizational mission to the changing character of man's historic condition. Education and particularly social education in large measure is a matter of building self-identification. The child brings to the school, albeit in unarticulated form, the fundamental question: "Who am I?" and "What are we?" The school along with parents, the mass media, peers and other agents of socialization in complex societies, provides a series of answers some fraction of which the young humans internalize and organize into an expanding self image of who and what they are. In contemporary society the cultural sources of our self conceptions are no longer confined to the traditional disciplines of history, geography, philosophy, and theology superimposed upon the folk culture of the society. In recent years the social, or more broadly and accurately, the behavioral sciences have become increasingly significent sources of knowledge about man, his behaviors, and the societies and social institutions our species creates and destroys. Thus, the development of some understanding of who and what we are as biological systems, as personality systems, as the creatures and the creators of cultural systems and as the participants in systems of social action requires a curriculum that blends the traditional concerns of the historian, the geographer, and the guardians of the society's heritage with the concerns of sociology, political science, economics, anthropology, etc.

Third, the schools are being called upon to evolve conceptions of the aims of formal education congruent with the realities of rapid and extensive change in American society and the world at large. We live in a period unique in modern history, as Alfred North Whitehead points out, in that we can no longer assume that each new generation will live out their lives in circumstances substantially the same as those which govern the lives of the present generation.

Some of the implications of this for education are obvious although the task of translating these into the "nitty-gritty" of curriculum reform are not. Childhood and adolescence must be a time when individuals are trained to "face a novelty of conditions." Pre-adult education, in large measure, must be aimed at preparing individuals to anticipate change and at developing those qualities of heart and mind which would seem to be functional in coping with continually changing social and cultural environments.

What kind of contributions can elementary and secondary schools make to the development of human beings capable of living with continuous change? Many educators have come to argue that the schools' primary and most durable contribution to a young person's education lies in developing within him or her the attitude and skills requisite to continuous learning. In a word, it would seem that the schools ought to be primarily environments in which individuals learn to learn.

No one is sufficiently pretentious to claim to know fully what are the essential features of a curriculum that equips individuals for a life of continuous learning, but in the absence of evidence to the contrary, it is reasonable to assume that the school years should be a time when individuals cultivate a capacity for conceptual and critical thinking combined with some understanding of and skill in the processes of systematic inquiry and reflective ethical judgment.

The task of responding constructively to these demands is, at best, an arduos organizational enterprise, and for some schools a politically sensitive venture. In general, the schools' pattern of response is what a student of complex organizations would predict. Curriculum change, on the whole, fits very well the social scientist's model of incremental and disjointed decision-making for innovations have tended to come incrementally and change has been disjointed. (2) To the traditional academic fare is added a bit of instruction about foreign policy; at still another time and place in the curriculum a bit of cultural anthropology; at another grade level some work in foreign area studies; elsewhere something about the U.N.; a unit or two on communism; a bit of international relations; and perhaps a work on "critical thinking."

While this strategy of change cannot be faulted since one cannot reasonably expect a system as large, as decentralized, and as politically sensitive as American education to react to demands for change in any other way, this pattern bears the predictable social costs. One of the more important of these is an accumulation of a good deal of confusion and uncertainty about what ought to be happening to individuals as a result of the schools' efforts to teach about the world into which they have been cast. Confusion and uncertainty about the objectives of international education in turn breeds confusion, uncertainty, and one suspects non-rationality in the decisions determining the specifics of curriculum content and organization. Charles McClelland illustrates the problem in this way:

> Should the Pueblos be studied in the fourth grade? The answer needs to be cast in terms of what it is that would make the factual information about the Pueblos relevant to some particular learning objective and it would be conceivable that the Ainus, Todas, or Zulus might serve the purpose just as well. Is modern history more important than ancient history to "know about" in a world history course and should Western Europe receive more attention than China? Is a geographical interpretation more valuable than an economic interpretation? Should the histories of wars be subordinated and accomplishments of peaceful evolution be stressed? Is it more important that the content of some social science disciplines be transferred to the social studies while the content of others is omitted? Is there some particular body of factual information that must be taught in the 12 years between kindergarten and college, no matter what the order and the form? The argument here is that these questions and hundreds of others of the same type are not independent and that there is no significant answer to them unless further criteria are provided. (3)

The criteria that McClelland has in mind includes a relatively detailed conception of the objectives that should be served by the international dimension of the curriculum. Needless to say, this matter of objectives is not a virginal issue. It has been worried over by most educators as well as by many social scientists and has been written about by a respectable fraction of scholars. The most complete collection of statements about curriculum objectives in the field of international education is found in the pages of the 1954 yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies, Approaches to an Understanding of World Affairs.(4) Many of these are couched in sufficiently general terms to permit being stated in a few sentences. Various similar statements issued by various educational bodies share this characteristic of being general.

Nor is much assistance forthcoming from those who have written on the subject of teaching world affairs at the college level. Such studies as those of Bidwell and of the Wilsons, for example, stress the importance of teaching for responsible U.S. citizenship and for civic competence in an age of swift change and frequent crisis, as well as stressing the inherent educational values of a liberal education whose content is cosmopolitan.(5) While valuable in considering what ought to be the general outcomes of education, these writings are also too broad to offer a clear focus for cirriculum-building.

There are, moreover, divergent views of objectives which have not been either faced or reconciled. Statements by Kenworthy and Laves, among others are plainly oriented primarily toward the well-being of the world as a whole, rather than the nation.(6) Others, such as Kirk, build on the premise that the focus must be that of learning to function intelligently "as a citizen of a great democracy."(7) Educational planning will be quite different if it is based on supra-national premises, the needs of the nation-state, or some system which in one way or another reconciles these. Shall teaching be value-free and primarily analytical and factual, or shall it inculcate values thought to be essential to world peace? As Becker and Porter have pointed out:

> The point here is that our motivations, our concerns, will largely determine the nature of the program or curriculum and the instructional materials used. If we are confused about our purpose or have ill-defined purposes, then the courses involved and their goals are also likely to be confused and lacking in direction. An analysis of curriculum guides, with respect to international understanding, reveals in most instances a lack of focus or framework. Since the term "international understanding" is poorly defined, the programs themselves seldom contain clear criteria for selecting content and approaches.(8).

II

THE CONCEPT OF INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

If we take as a starting point for a discussion of the objectives of international education the traditional prescription that the schools should promote students' international or world understanding, then the task before us is one of trying to spell out in a resonable degree of detail the meaning of the term "international understanding." The following pages represent the output of my efforts to do this.

It seems to me that the concept of international understanding has two faces. On the one hand, it points our attention outward toward the world and to the objects, things, or phenomenon which we want students to come to understand, to comprehend, or to become knowledgable about. On the other hand, the concept [illegible] points inward and directs our attention to the qualities or characteristics of persons which we want to develop within students. If such be the case, then the task of explicating the meaning for international understanding is a dual problem of specifying on the one hand what there is about the world that we believe students should begin to understand in the course of K-12 schooling, and on the other hand of specifying the cognitive and/or affective qualities of individuals that we believe should be cultivated or promoted by K-12 schooling. For the lack of better labels, I shall refer to the first of these matters as "objects" of international understanding and to the second as "dimensions" of international understanding.

OBJECTS OF INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

The verb "to understand" implies the existence of things or objects to be understood and the concept to international understanding accordingly implies the existence of objects within or things about the world that we believe students should come to understand. What are the objects of international understanding?

Few schools and not many educators (or for that matter social scientists) will claim to have a formal theory or developed philosophy of international education that provides an answer to this question. However, this does not mean the question has gone unanswered. In lieu of explicit philosophies, curriculum is grounded in unarticulated but nonetheless operating conceptions of what international education is all about. An examination of the curriculum guides, teaching materials and approaches used in many schools suggests that perhaps the most widely prevailing conception is a notion of international education as education about other lands and peoples. Question: What do we want students to understand? Answer: Other lands and other peoples.

As a conceptual foundation on which to build curriculum this point of view would seem to suffer some serious weaknesses. In the first place, most educators properly agree that one of the overall purposes of international studies in the schools is to reduce the influence of ethnocentrism on students' perceptions of the world. But by conceiving of education for international understanding to be education about other lands and peoples, a "we-they"or "us-them" distinction is built into the very heart of the enterprise. Also the dividing of the world into "things American" and "things non-American" for purposes of their study, obscures the degree to which studies of American history, society, and social institutions have important international dimensions and can serve to either detract from or augment the development of students' understanding of the world beyond their nation's boundaries.

Moreover, the adequacy of our conceptions of international education depend in large measure upon the adequacy of our images of what the world is like. Conceptions of international education as education about other lands and peoples appear to rest upon an image of the world as a mosaic of richly varied lands and peoples. An anthropologist examining the artifacts of American education (particularly curriculum guides and teaching materials found in many elementary schools) in an effort to reconstruct the world view of American educators might well conclude that we tend to look upon the earth as a large pool table whose surface supports an array of scattered and largely self-contained billard balls of many different colors. Given this perspective on the world, international education is then seen as being largely a matter of instructing young Americans about a few of the world's many colorful lands and peoples other than themselves; that is, providing students with some information about the different ecologies, the particular histories, and the unique cultures of some of the many different balls arrayed about the table's surface. Clearly this is an excessively simplified picture, but perhaps not an entirely gross caricature of the international dimension of the curriculum found in many schools.

There is nothing wrong with our traditional conceptions in the sense of being incorrect. The world is in fact a large and varied array of different civilizations, geographical regions, cultural areas and societies with differing histories, cultural systems, and social institutions. Nor is there any question that international studies must consist in large measure of transmitting to young Americans some knowledge and hopefully a set of responsible attitudes toward the planet's many other lands and the wide variation that characterizes the human species' cultural life and social institutions, in the hope that by learning about others, Americans will also better understand themselves.

But our conceptions of things can be correct and at the same time incomplete or inadequate. Such would seem the case with the notion of international education as education about other lands and peoples. Specifically, this approach fails to highlight the fact that contemporary children and young people need to develop some understanding of the relationships and interactions among the world's national societies and cultural regions and some understanding of the expanding network of cross-national organizations and associations that link together all regions of the planet, as well as an understanding of the similarities and differences that characterize the world's local societies and cultural areas.

This failure to highlight the importance of inter-societal interactions and cross-national organizations as objects of understanding or knowledge would seem to be one specific manifestation of a more general and basic inadequacy inherent in our traditional conception of international education. The basic conceptions or definitions that undergird any enterprise derive their value from how well they serve as guides to action and directives for thought appropriate to the needs of particular groups in a particular time and place. Thus, the criteria in terms of which we must judge the adequacy of our conception of education for international understanding are the educational needs of children and young people who will live out most of their adult lives in the Twenty-first Century and who will become, in the apt symbolism of Lewis Paul Todd, "the first settlers to colonize the lunar wastes."(9)

While we cannot know with any great precision the particular characteristics of all of these needs, we do know they are somewhat different from our own and certainly different from those of our parents and grandparents. They are different simply because the world is different. It is conventional, indeed, it has become somewhat trite, to look upon ourselves as participants in a revolutionary epoch in human history. But however passé such characterizations may be, they seem true nonetheless. "We are experiencing," observes the historian C.E. Black, "one of the great revolutionary transformations of mankind."(10) He dramatizes, but one suspects does not exaggerate, the magnitude of this transformation in this way:

> The change in human affairs that is now taking place is of a scope and intensity that mankind has experienced on only two previous occasions, and its significance cannot be appreciated except in the context of the entire course of world history. The first revolutional transformation was the emergence of human beings, about a million years ago, after thousands of years of evolution from primitive life. . . . The second great revolutionary transformation in human affairs was that from primitive to civilized societies. . . .(11)

While not all historians would agree that these two epochal events exhaust the periods of revolutionary transformation in human affairs, most serious students of man's contemporary condition are likely to concede that they serve as useful analogues in our efforts to understand what is happening in the Twentieth Century. For, as Black goes on to note: "The process of change in the modern era is of the same order of magnitude as that from prehuman to human life and from primitive to civilized societies. . . .(12)

With the possible exception of the world's population explosion the type of change that receives the most attention and about which we are most familiar is scientific and technological change. Statistics on the exponential growth of scientific and technological innovations have become in recent years as familiar bits of social accounting as are figures on rates of economic growth or the level of crime. That we should be particularly sensitive to the unrelenting flow of contemporary science and technology is as appropriate as it is understandable since these appear to be the primary dynamic or chief source of socio-cultural change within modern societies. Perhaps educators and social scientists should occasionally pause and, taking a check list of basic social activities (such as the one outlined by Paul Hanna as a basis for organizing elementary social studies curriculum(13), note the multiplicity of ways in which each of these activities is being continuously transformed by the labors of scientists and technologists. Such an exercise not only points up the obvious fact that particular social activities undergo change as a result of scientific and technological innovations, but also the equally important fact that these changes interact and ramify their consequences throughout the fabric of society. Not only does change come in particular sectors of social life such as the economy, the polity, or the transportation and communication systems, but added together they result in the transformation of the over-all structure of society.

What is true of particular national and local societies is also true of the world as a whole. Advances in science and technology have multiplied by many fold the destructiveness of weapons, radically increased the speed of their delivery systems, augmented the rapidity and scope of transcontinental transportation and communication, magnified rates of human population growth, and increased the volume and range of transactions among national societies, etc. The cumulative impact of these particular changes is a substantial transformation in the social organization of the human species at the global level.

This transformation perhaps is manifest most visibly in the erosion of the boundaries that once separated international and domestic affairs. The late Dr. Martin Luther King is awarded an international peace prize not because he was a diplomat in the relations among nations, but because he was a statesman in the relations of racial and ideological groups within American Society. A war in Southeast Asia significantly influences the history of urban areas in the United States. On the other side of the coin, the national conventions of the American political parties are no longer just national affairs but have become events in the international community receiving press attention and TV coverage from London to La Paz. "If ever a line could be drawn between domestic and foreign affairs," writes Senator Fulbright, "it is now wholly erased."(14) This is somewhat of an hyperbole because some significant distinctions can be made between domestic and foreign affairs,(15) but the observation emphasizes what ought to be emphasized. That is the fact that Americans unrelentlessly interject themselves into the lives of the planet's other inhabitants and they in turn continuously impinge upon American society.

The changing relationship of the United States to the world beyond our boundaries is often characterized as the decline of American isolation or the revolution in U.S. foreign policy. While such characterizations are accurate, taken by themselves they fail to highlight the fact that America's experience vis-a-vis its world environment is not uniquely American. To the contrary, ours is a common history shared in varying degrees with all of mankind in the Twentieth Century. If American society has become substantially less isolated from the world around it, the same is also true of virtually all of the national societies that comprise the modern world. Raymond Aron and others speak of the coming of "universal history" signifying the fact that the human species qua species is acquiring a shared history which is more than the sum total of hundreds of common local histories. Robert Harper makes the same point in noting that "throughout most of history, mankind did exist in separate, almost isolated cultural islands. . . . now most of humanity is part of a single world-wide system."(16) Raymond Platig illustrates part of what this means in this way:

> Civil disturbances in the Congo and in South Viet Nam have their repercussions in New York, Moscow, and Peking: crop failure in India calls forth a response from the American midwest; nuclear explosive power unites men around the world in the fear of holocaust and the dread of environmental contamination; physical changes on the surface of the sun affect man's ability to communicate with his fellow men; complex sensors located in artificial earth satellites reveal guarded secrets concerning the capabilities of another group; a desert war east of Suez threatens to bring the industrial machinery of Europe to a grinding halt; new ideological notes struck on the taut strings of Balkan Societies set up entirely new patterns of harmony and disharmony in world affairs.(17)

Norman Cousins writes in a similar vein of the emergence of a world or global community noting:

> A new musical comedy erupts into success on Broadway and within a matter of weeks its tunes are heard all the way from London to Johannesburg, as though they had pre-existed and were waiting only for a signal from the United States to spring to life. Or a new movie about the Russia of a half-century ago will be made from a book, and all over the world the theme song from Doctor Zhivago will be a request favorite of orchestras in far-off places, from Edmonton to Warsaw.

> Few things are more startling to Americans abroad than to see youngsters affect the same unconventionalities in dress and manner, whether in Stockholm, Singapore, or Sydney. The young girls with their flashing thighs on Carnaby Street in London or on the Ginza in Tokyo; the young males with their long hair and turtleneck sweaters (with or without beads) in Greenwich Village or the Left Bank or Amsterdam or HongKong--all seem to have been fashioned by the same stylists of alienation and assertion.
>
> Or a fashion designer in Paris will decide to use spikes instead of heels on women's shoes, and women across the world will wobble with the same precarious gait. Then, almost as suddenly, the designer will decide to bring women back to earth again, flattening the heels and producing square or wide toes that only a few years earlier would have been regarded as acceptable only for heavy work in the fields--and once again the world's women will conform.(18)

The general point being made is summarized in Barbara Ward's observation that in many respects the world has "become a single human community."

> Most of the energies of our society tend towards unity -- the energy of science and technological change, the energy of curiosity and research, of self-interest and economics, the energy -- in many ways the most violent of them all -- the energy of potential aggression and destruction. We have become neighbors in terms of inescapable physical proximity and instant communication. We are neighbors in economic interest and technological direction. We are neighbors in the risk of total destruction. (19)

Needless to say, no one can forecast with assurance the shape of the future, but it is reasonable to assume that the global human community will continue to manifest a high and very likely expanding degree of interdependence in the decades immediately ahead. (This assumes the absence of world-wide thermonuclear war whose effect on the social organization of the surviving fraction of mankind is very uncertain.) Most observers of world affairs will probably agree with Bruce Russett's assessment of the future world system.

> At this time it is too soon to know just what kind of system will emerge, or even if the situation will, in the near future, stabilize enough for us even to be fully aware that we have a new system. But we do

> know that it is changing. . . . We can be quite sure that it will be a world system in which all peoples will be much more closely involved than ever before. . . . "One world" has a meaning beyond the understanding even of those who lived just a generation ago.(20)

All of this represents, as Kenneth Boulding has observed, a profound innovation in the historic human condition:

> Because of what has happened in the field of technology, especially of transportation and weaponry, in the past few decades, the world has become a "spaceship," a small rather crowded globe hurtling through space to an unknown destination and bearing on its surface a very fragile freight of mankind and the noosphere which inhabits men's minds.
>
> This represents a very fundamental change in the condition of man, a change which furthermore only a few people have really appreciated. Up till very recently the human race was expanding on what was for all practical purposes an illimitable plane. It may have been "a darkling plain where ignorant armies clash by night," as Matthew Arnold called it, but it was for all practical purposes an illimitable, if rough, plane. As long as there was always somewhere to go over the horizon, neither ignorance nor armies nor clashes could be fatal. If one civilization collapsed another one could always rise a few hundred miles away. All history, in other words, until very recently, has been local and has not involved the concept of the "sociosphere" or the total sphere of all human activity extending all around the earth.(21)

The transformation of the world from an "illimitable plane" to a "spaceship" obviously carries far reaching implications for education. Minimally, it enhances the importance of international studies. But it seems to me that the implications go well beyond simply the need to expand the international content of the K-12 curriculum by adding new courses or "internationalizing" old courses, however important such curriculum changes may be. Specifically, there would seem to be a pressing need to examine the conceptual base that underlies our traditional efforts to teach about the world. I will try to spell out what I mean.

In the study of any phenomena one has a choice of approaches. One can focus upon the whole or one can focus upon the parts or components that comprise that whole. As J. David Singer observes:

> Whether in the physical or social sciences, the observer may choose to focus upon the parts or upon the whole, upon the components or upon the

> system. He may, for example, choose between the flowers or the garden, the rocks or the quarry, the trees or the forest, the houses or the neighborhood, the cars or the traffic jam, the delinquents or the gang. . . .(22)

The choice one makes is a function of his purposes. If one's aim is to understand trees as trees, then he need pay little or no attention to whether the particular trees he studies are components of a forest. On the other hand, if one's purpose is to understand forests, then he will also study trees, but in this case they must be viewed and examined as components of the larger whole he seeks to understand.

In the case of international education the issues of "the parts and the whole" was probably pedagocially unimportant, if not downright irrelevant in a time when the world was characterized by many parts but evidenced relatively little "wholeness" compared to what is the case today and is likely to be even more so tomorrow. But the emergence of a "spaceship earth" makes the matter of the whole and the parts of critical importance in our efforts to think about the structure and objective of international education. It is critical because just as an accumulation of knowledge about trees as trees is not equivalent to an understanding of forests or an aggregation of knowledge about each of the fifty American states does not equal an understanding of American society as American society, so an aggregation of knowledge about the parts that make up the world is not equivalent to an understanding of the world as a whole. This means that we confront the hard and complex question of what basic purposes underlie and guide our efforts to educate young humans about the world into which they have been born. Can the underlying purpose of international education legitimately be restricted to the development of an aggregated fund of knowledge about the different elements that make up the world, or, should our ambitions extend to the development of some understanding of the world perceived as a totality? Clearly, it would seem that education appropriate to needs of today's and tomorrow's young people must endeavor to develop or cultivate some understanding of the world as a totality in very much the same sense that studies of American society as a totality rather than simply as an aggregation of parts. In a word, it appears that the kind of international understanding that we should seek to promote within students is not so much an understanding of other lands and peoples but rather an understanding of the world or earth system as a totality and of ourselves and others as parts of this larger whole.

Robert Harper has made this point very well in talking about the international dimension of education in geography.

> . . . the whole world is more important than its parts. It is understanding of the worldwide system of humanity living on the earth that we want the student to grasp, not just an understanding of the

> parts -- the regions that have been the center of the geographer's attention. The region is no longer primarily important in itself. The important thing is to see how it fits into the larger world system.
>
> This calls for a whole new approach in geography. No longer can we study the United States just in terms of learning its own characteristics with those of other parts of the . . . world with the aim of seeing similarities and differences. We must now see the United States as part of the worldwide system of ideas, goods and people.
>
> Of course, to understand the world as a whole we must scrutinize the parts, but the aim is always to see the part in the context of the bigger whole.(23)

Harper's point is clearly not confined to world geography, but can readily be generalized to all dimensions of an individual's international understanding. For example, it would seem that we should seek to develop a historical understanding that comes from treating mankind as the unit of analysis in contrast to particular national or regional groups within mankind. Lefton Stavrianos describes such an understanding in this way:

> It means the perspective of an observer perched on the moon rather than ensconced in London or Paris or Washington. It means that for every period of history we are interested in events and movements of global rather than regional or national significance. More specifically it means the realization that in the classical period Han China was the equal of the Roman Empire in every respect; that in the medieval period the Mongols were infinitely more significant than Magna Carta; that in early modern times Russia's expansion overland and Western Europe's expansion overseas were likewise more noteworthy than the Reformation or the Wars of Religion; and that today the globally significant developments have to do not with Cold War blocs and crises but rather with the passing of Western hegemony and the reversion to the traditional autonomy of the regions of the world.(24)

Mark Krug appears to have much the same kind of perspective in mind when he writes about a mankind centered perspective in world history.(25)

A General Definition of International Understanding---In the context of the argument sketched out above we can broadly define international understanding as an understanding of the world system, or if one prefers, an understanding of world or global society. Two points must be made about this formulation.

First, and obviously, no one attains a complete understanding or a full comprehension of the world system as a totality. Indeed, it is impossible to say what such understanding would consist of short of the omniscence traditionally attributed to God. Second, and perhaps equally obvious, the developing of international understanding in the sense defined here is a life-long process. The schools, and more particularly the K-12 curriculum are but one of many sources or agents of international learning. Since the schools do not monopolize the process of international education, it is necessary to ask: what are the particular contributions which the K-12 curriculum can and should make to the development of students' international understanding?

I have attempted to develop an answer to this question within a context suggested by the selection of the twin verbs "can and should." On the one hand I have tried to maintain a sensitivity to what many perceive to be the "radical" nature of modern man's educational needs, and on the other hand, I have also sought to maintain some awareness of the imperatives of practicality. The concept of world system is not a familiar notion in the culture of American education, and curriculum based squarely on an elaboration of this concept would be a radical departure from tradition in many respects. Among other things, it calls for a re-combination and the integration of a great many elements that are currently distributed about the physical, earth, and life sciences, the humanities, mathematics, and the behavioral sciences. In my judgement curriculum organized around an image of the world as a complex cluster of interpenetrating living and non-living systems represents a target toward which developmental efforts ought to be aimed, but the task of moving between where we now stand and the goal seems to be a matter of incrementally modifying existing curriculum. What is currently needed, it would appear, is a conception of the schools' contributions to the development of students' understanding of the world system that can serve as a bridge between the present and the future.

It seems to me that there are three standards which a conception ought to meet in order to function as a bridge between the present and the future. It must be partially grounded in the traditional concerns of the schools' curriculum. It must reflect basic trends or the forward thrusts of the contemporary curriculum reform movement. Finally, it must point to logical next steps in curriculum reform.

With these criteria in mind it may prove useful to think of the curriculum making three general kinds of contributions to the development of students' understanding of the world system. First, the K-12 curriculum can and should develop students' understanding of the earth as a planet. Second, the curriculum should develop students' understanding of mankind viewed as one species of life. Third, the curriculum should develop students' understanding of the international system as one level of human social organization and one of a multiplicity of social systems in which individuals participate and through which human values such as wealth, power, health, enlightenment, and respect are created and allocated among members of the human species.

This conception or general model of the objects of international understanding appears to meet the criteria noted above. The model's first element, that is the planet earth, is a long standing concern of traditional curriculum in the social studies as well as the sciences. The second element -- the development of an understanding of the human species as one of many forms of life -- reflects one of the more pervasive thrusts of the contemporary curriculum reform movement. From the "new biology" to the "new social studies" there is a growing interest in enhancing the scope and sophistication of students' understanding of man qua man. This is evidenced among other places in efforts to globalize studies of human history, in a growing interest in anthropology, in efforts to make more extensive and sophisticated use of man-other animal comparisons, and in efforts to build into the curriculum behavioral science oriented studies of basic human behaviors and social activities.

The third element of the model, that is, the development of an understanding of the global social system viewed as one of several analytically comparable levels of human social organization is less familiar and represents somewhat of an innovation in our customary modes of approaching the study of international affairs. However, the image of the world as a global social system is becoming a very familiar notion in international studies at the university level,(26) and is at the elementary and secondary levels of American education simply an extension of several current trends. The basic concept of social system is finding its way into the curriculum. Moreover, if we can make mankind qua mankind the unit of analysis in studies of the species' history and in studies of the ways in which man resembles and differs from other animals, there is no reason why we cannot think of the species qua species as being socially organized just as we think of particular groups within the species as being socially organized. Furthermore, as comparative analysis becomes an increasingly familiar mode of inquiry in the social studies, the notion of comparing the global social system (or selected aspects of it) with social systems at the sub-global level would seem to be simply a logical extension of the logic of comparing nations with nations, political systems with political systems, and so on. For example, if students can be taught how to compare two or more national political systems of particular nations or of other groups at the sub-global level.(28) In short, the notion of the curriculum developing an understanding of the global social system appears to be simply a logical extension of ideas currently entering the curriculum.

Needless to say, the schools can communicate to children and young people only a very limited amount of information and conceptualization about the planet earth, the human species, and the global social system. Thus, anyone endeavoring to develop a model of the "objects" of international understanding immediately faces one aspect of that many faceted issue conventionally dubbed the "coverage problem." Given the fact that what the schools can teach is only a very small sample of the total population of knowledge that might be communicated to students, what ought to be selected from this total universe to be emphasized by the curriculum? More specifically, what is there about the planet, about the species, and about the global social system that ought to be emphasized in the planning and developing of future programs in international education?

Clearly these are basic queries, and because of this they are far from being original questions. In the following pages I have not tried to be original in the sense of proffering answers not found in the literature of American education. Rather I have attempted to "sample" the state of current thinking and to capsulize in summary form what I perceive to be major thrusts in this thinking.

The Planet Earth as an Object of Understanding---The earth as a planet has traditionally been an object of inquiry in both the science and social studies curriculums. I have not attempted to deal with the issue of what an understanding of the planet implies from the vantage point of the earth sciences qua earth sciences. Rather I have sought to look at the problem from the perspective of developing students' international understanding broadly defined as an understanding of the world system or of world society. From this perspective two general points seem to stand out and each of these in turn implies two or three somewhat more specific points.

In the first place, an understanding of the world system would seem to imply some existential awareness and cognitive comprehension of the location of the human venture on the vast continua of cosmic space and time. In turn this would seem to imply some understanding of the status and location of the earth as a planet in the cosmic system. Second, it would seem to imply some understanding of the cosmological and geological histories of the planet earth. Third, it would seem to imply some comparative understanding of the earth, that is, some understanding of similarities and differences between the earth and other known planets and perhaps imagined planets as protrayed, for example, in science fiction literature, movies, and TV.

In the second place the development of an understanding of the world system would seem to imply the development of some understanding of the planet earth as "the home of man"(to use a common but seldom fully developed image from elementary education). This is to say, that the concept of international education seems to imply some appreciateion of the fact that just as the behavior of a child is both shaped by and in turn shapes his family as a social system, so man and more broadly the larger system of life of which man is a part is both conditioned by and shapes the planet viewed as an in interpenetrating series of physical systems. In turn this would seem to imply the development of some understanding of major features of the planet's contemporary geology and major characteristics of its current geography with special emphasis upon an understanding of the interrelation of these to biological evolution of life and particularly the bio-cultural development of the human species. Second, it would seem to imply the development of some understanding of current and anticipated worldwide problems in man-biosphere relations, such as air, water, and soil pollution, mineral resources depletion, weather control, and shortages of organic matter needed for human food.

The Human Species as an Object of Understanding---As noted elsewhere, there is a growing stress upon the problem of developing within students a relatively sophisticated understanding of their own species. My efforts to crystallize and summarize what I perceive to be major thrusts in current thinking about this matter yielded seven general conclusions.

First, there appears to be a growing conviction that in the course of their K-12 schooling students should begin to develop a conceptually sophisticated comparative understanding of man as one of many forms of life or types of living systems. This would seem to imply in the first instance the development of some comparative understanding of life and non-life, that is, some understanding of differences and similarities in living and non-living systems. (This, needless to say involves some consideration of the matter of death.) Secondly, a comparative understanding of man implies some understanding of similarities and differences between man and other living systems. These other systems include most obviously other contemporary animals and the "proto-human" animals that appear to be homo sapiens immediate evolutionary predecessors. The obvious dimensions of comparison include man-other animal physiology, man-other animal psychology, and man-other animal sociology.

The total universe of living systems to which man can be compared also includes imagined forms of life elsewhere in the universe as portrayed, for example, in better science fiction literature. Also, for children of the "post-modern" era, the population of analytically comparable living forms should include the prospect of "artifically" created life. As Kenneth Boulding observes, it is very likely that soon man will put his

> busy little fingers into the business of genetic evolution. We might even recreate the dodo and the dinosaur and then go on to the imaginary animals, the centaurs and the fauns. This is the kind of world for which we might have to prepare our children.(29)

Still another dimension of man-other "living system" comparison that can legitimately occupy a niche in contemporary education is man-complex machine comparisons. Zbigniew Brzensinski, in reviewing what we might reasonably expect to see in the course of the next few decades, reflects the estimate of many observers in noting:

> Scientists predict with some confidence that by the end of this century, computers will reason as well as man, and will be able to engage in 'creative' thought; wedded to the robots or to 'laboratory beings,' they could act like humans. The makings of a most complex -- and perhaps bitter -- philosophical and political dialogue about the nature of man are self-evident in these developments.(30)

Second, many educators and social scientists continue to stress the traditional theme that the K-12 curriculum should serve to develop students' understanding of basic human commonalities. While it is not always clear what people have in mind when they speak of human commonalities, four kinds of similarities are noted with some regularity. First, and most obviously, are commonalities in man's physiological characteristics and biological needs (e.g., need for food, water, air, protection from temperature extremes, etc.). Second, are the commonalities in man's psychic or psychological needs (e.g., the need for cognitive order or meaning, the need for affection, the need for a sense of self respect, the need for predictability in social relationships, etc.). Third, are similarities or commonalities in the functional needs or requisites of human societies and in their component social and cultural systems (e.g., the need to socialize the young into the norms of the society, the need for social control, the need for conflict resolution, etc.). Fourth, are similarities, analogs, or parallels in the historical experiences of different groups (e.g., similarities in the function of the frontiers in American and Soviet societies; parallels in the foreign policy behavior of the United States as a "new nation" and the foreign policy behaviors of new nations in Africa and Asia; analogs between the treatment of Indians in American society and apartheid policy in the Union of South Africa, etc.).

Third, there is a good deal of stress placed upon the importance of developing within students some understanding of the sources within the human condition of variations or differences in human actions and ways of life. Minimally this takes the form of the argument that students should develop an understanding of the interrelated facts that: (1) most human actions are socially learned behaviors (in contrast to being biologically determined); (2) that what individuals learn is determined in large measure by the content of the culture of the group(s) into which they have been born and/or in which they are members; (3) the content of the culture of different groups varies; and (4) variations in the culture of human groups (both) societies and sub-groups within societies) is the cumulative result of many factors including the facts that the human species lives on a geographically and climatically heterogenous planet; that the species historically has been spacially dispersed and fragmented into several thousand local societies many of which have been socially isolated from each other; that a society's or a group's culture is a product of its historical experience which is, like the personal experience of individuals, unique in some respects.

Fourth, and closely related to the last point, is an increasing emphasis upon the importance of developing within students understandings of basic human behavior and social activities that are grounded in the concepts, theories, and analytical problems of the behavioral sciences. This emphasis appears to assume two major related forms. One is in the form of a call for behavioral science based studies of particular human behaviors or social activities (e.g. attitude formation, socialization, urbanization, political participation, etc.) The second is in the form of an argument that students should come to understand human beings (1) as biological systems, (2) as personality systems, (3) as actors or role occupants within social systems, (4) as 'products' of cultural systems, and (5) as participants in natural ecological systems.

Fifth, there is clearly an emphasis in a great deal of current thinking about what students ought to come to understand about the human species on the importance of developing a conceptual understanding of what can be termed 'structural characteristics' of man as a species of life. By 'structural characteristics" I have in mind characteristics of the human species that substanially condition, mold, or structure inter-personal and inter-group relations. What are these 'structural characteristics' about which students should develop some understanding? The following inventory is hardly exhaustive, but it appears to summerize a range of phenomena about which the K-12 curriculum should develop some conceptual understanding.

The human species is a racially diverse species.

The human species is a linguistically diverse species.

The human species is a culturally diverse species, that is, characterized by variations in socially shared perceptions, cognition, and valuations. (This would include diversity in religious systems and in systems of socio-political ideology, e.g. democracy, communism, socialism, etc.)

The human species is an institutionally diverse species, that is, characterized by variations in family systems, educational systems, political systems, economic systems, etc.

The human species is in general an economically depressed species but with vast disparaties in the wealth, education, health, etc. enjoyed by its members.

The human species is a politically uncentralized (or stateless) species.

The human species is demographically a rapidly expanding species.

The human species is an increasingly urbanized species.

The human species is an increasingly violent species (the number of human beings who become victims of violent conflict is increasing).

The human species is an increasingly industrialized (or more broadly a mechanized) species.

The human species is an increasingly interdependent species.

Sixth, there clearly is a growing concern with developing within students a "species centered" or "globally focused" understanding of man's biological evolution and our cultural development as a species. This is evidenced in efforts to place contemporary man in the perspective of the species' natural history the bulk of which transpired before the dawn of the classical civilizations. It is also evidenced in efforts to focus upon the "great transformations" the periods of step-wise change, in the human condition as points of emphasis in the cultivation of young humans' historical understanding of their species.

Seventh, and clearly related to the last point but perhaps deserving of special note, is the emphasis placed by many educators and social scientists upon the importance of developing students' understanding of the process or dynamics of socio-cultural change within the species and between the species and its physical and biological environments. Since rapid and extensive change is such a pervasive feature of modern life, and for countless millions such an emotionally traumatic and socially disruptive experience, it is argued, the phenomena of change warrants special attention in the modern school's efforts to develop students' understanding of man qua man.

The Global Social System as an Object of Understanding

The international or global social system constitutes the third element in the general model of the "objects" of international understanding. What kinds of understanding or knowledge can and should the K-12 curriculum seek to impart about the international social system?

First, an understanding of the international social system implies some knowledge of the major units or entities that comprise the contemporary international system. In the context of elementary and secondary education it would seem that we might usefully think of the international system as being comprised of three kinds of entities: territorial based societies of which the modern world's 130 or so nation-states are the primary contemporary type; cross-national organizations; and areas of "internationally owned" space.

In respect to the first of these -- nation-states -- there is very widespread agreement that in addition to developing some knowledge about American and European societies, students should develop some knowledge about African, Asian, and Latin American societies. In the second place, many educators and social scientists are stressing that the kind of knowledge about societies that students ought to be acquiring is a comparative understanding. The call for comparative understanding appears to assume two major forms. One is essentially cross-historical comparison. The plea is for an understanding of the ways in which contemporary nation-states and particularly large scale, complex, and highly industrialized states resemble and differ from primitive and traditional societies. The second is essentially cross-sectional comparison of contemporary nation-states. The plea is for the development of an understanding of concepts in terms of which the geography, histories, demography, social structure, cultures, levels of economic development, etc. of different societies can be compared. Or, to put the point a bit differently, it is argued that students should not be learning discrete information about particular nations (e.g. the chief exports of country X are soybean oil and tin ore; X is ruled by a monarch; most of the people in X are very poor, etc.). Rather, they ought to be acquiring concepts which permit students to array nations of the modern world along different dimensions relating to differences and similarities in their history, geography, politics, economics, culture, relations with other nations, etc.

In respect to cross-national organizations there appears to be three distinct points that are emphasized by many educators and social scientists. First, and the most general, is that contemporary students' understanding of cross-national organization cannot be legitmately confined to a bit of knowledge about the U.N. Students' should develop some consciousness (even if they cannot acquire a great deal of information) about the more than one hundred organizations that link governments to governments and the several hundred private or non-governmental organizations that span national boundaries, particularly large international business organizations, professional associations, and the international scientific community.

Two, there is an emphasis, particularly on the part of social scientists, on the importance of developing students' understanding of cross-national organizations in terms of the functions they perform within the international system in contrast to simply developing their knowledge of formal organizational structure. For example, students should develop some understanding of the U.N. in terms of the function it performs as a center of decision-making, a site for diplomatic negotiations, an agent in the channeling of economic resources from the developed to the developing nations, a forum for national propaganda, a peace-keeping or policing institution, etc.

Three, and closely related to the last point, there is some emphasis being placed upon the importance of developing students' understanding of cross-national organizations as alternative and/or supplementary organizational structures to nation-states in the performance of social economics and political functions within the international system, e.g., international organization as major agencies of economic development, international agencies as the "exploiters" of the mineral resources in the world's oceans and sea beds, etc.

By "internationally owned" space I have in mind of course the planet's polar regions, its oceans, and outer-space. The development of some understanding of the international status and actual and potential uses of these areas, particularly the planet's oceans and outer-space world seem to be a significant item in the development of students' understanding of the world system in light of the fact that these area are very likely to assume increasing salience in world affairs in the decades immediately ahead.

Second, an understanding of the international social system implies some understanding of the ways in which national societies relate to and ineract with one another. The development of such understanding in turn would seem to imply the development of students' understanding of the following processes. (Clearly this list is not exhaustive of all inter-societal processes, but it appears to capture the processes frequently stressed as being important phenomena about which students ought to develop some understanding.)

Inter-nation conflict and conflict resolution.

Inter-nation war.

Inter-nation collaboration and integration.

Inter-nation trade, foreign aid, and foreign investment.

Inter-nation migration.

Inter-nation communication and transportation.

Foreign policy decision-making.

Cultural diffusion.

Inter-nation influence (power).

The formation of international attitudes, images and perceptions.

Third, an understanding of the international social system appears to imply some historical understanding of the nation-state system. This reflects the thrust of an argument made by a rather large number of educators and social scientists to the effect that students should learn that historically the human species has been politically organized in many ways and that nation-states are but one of many possible systems. Students should come to understand that the political organization of the human species into more than one hundred nation-states is historically of recent origin. They should come to see that the nation-state system has been undergoing continuous change since its origin in Western Europe during the 17th Century and will continue to change and very likely will be superseded in time by new modes of political organization.

Fourth, the development of an understanding of the global social system implies the development of some understanding of major international social problems. By these I do not have in mind particular current international problems such as the Israel-Arab dispute, the Berlin question, the Kashmir issue, etc., but rather generalized problems created by the structure of the system and/or changes occuring within the system. Among major problems of continuing salience within the international community are:

The control of inter-group, particularly inter-nation, violence and the peaceful resolution of conflict.

The control of population growth.

Increasing the wealth, education, health, and power (capacity to participate in or influence social decisions that affect one's life) of the developing two-thirds of mankind.

Limiting or reducing the social and psychological costs of world wide urbanization, technological change, and the development of large-scale, highly bureaucratized social organizations, both private and public.

Limiting or controlling further deterioration in the human environment, in the biosphere -- that thin layer of earth, water, and air that supports all life.

Problems of exploiting the resources of the world's oceans and outer-space for the welfare of mankind in general.

Summary -- The concern of this paper is the question: what contributions can and should the K-12 curriculum make to childrens' and young peoples' international education?

I have noted that traditionally this question has been answered with the assertion that the curriculum ought to develop students' international understanding. The concept of international understanding implies that there are objects or things to be understood, and I have attempted up to this point to outline in summary form what might be considered to be major "objects" of international understanding.

First, I have said that in its broadest sense international understanding might be taken to mean an understanding of the world system.

Second, I have suggested that it might be useful to view the schools as being capable of making three primary kinds of contributions to the development of students' understanding of the world system; an understanding of the earth as a planet, an understanding of mankind as a species of life, and an understanding of the global social system as one level of human social organization.

Third, I have attempted to spell out in summary form what there is about the planet, the species, and the international social system that many educators and social scientists feel should be emphasized in teaching about these phenomena.

Dimensions of International Understanding

If the concept of international understanding points outward toward "objects" to be understood, the concept also points inward toward certain qualities, characteristics, or capacities to be developed within individuals. These are what I have in mind in speaking of the "dimensions" of international understanding.

Viewed from this perspective we can think of international understanding as a quality analogous to height or weight. That is, we can view international understanding as both a continum (more accurately a set of continua) and as a characteristic (more accurately a set of characteristics) possessed in varying degrees by individuals. Just as one can order a population of individuals along a continum ranging from those who possess the most height (the tallest) to those who possess the least height (the shortest); so in imagination, we can arrange individuals along a continuum ranging from those who possess a great deal of "international understanding" to those who possess very little "international understanding".

That is we can do this if we can conceptualize the qualities or characteristics that define "international understanding."

I feel that the conception of international education developed previously points to one (of what are hopefully many) promising approaches to this problem. If we can think of the world as a global system, then we can also usefully think of individuals as actors or participants in this system. If we do this, then we can ask the question: How do individuals participate in the world system? Or more broadly and accurately put, what are the modes in terms of which individuals relate to the world system?

Perhaps it may be useful to distinguish six primary ways or modes of relating to the world system at least in the context of elementary and secondary education. Or to use the term "role" in a very loose and popular sense, one might fruitfully think of individuals as performing six major roles within the world system.

First, individuals possess knowledge about and understanding of various phenomena within the world system.

Second, individuals make analytical judgments about various phenomena within the world system. By this I mean that they make judgments about what is or is not true, what is or is not empirically the case, what is or is not "reality" or "fact". To assert that poverty is a cause of revolutions; to believe that a rich world will be a peaceful world; to assert that alliances cause wars; to argue that differences in the types of clothes people wear can be the claim that there are racially related differences in human intelligence --- is to make analytic judgment about the world system.

Third, individuals make normative judgments or evaluations of phenomena within the world system. Most of the time these judgments are in the form of attitudes. To believe that it is wrong for the French government to stir up French Canadian separatist sentiment; to argue that it is not true that Viet Nam is an immoral war; to believe that foreigners are inferior to Americans --- is to make normative judgments.

Four, individuals are observers of the current history of the world system. The great bulk of the system's current history, including most "publically significant" events is experientially remote from the personal lives of most individuals and is known only indirectly. This means that the process of observing current history in large measure is a matter of sorting out, evaluating, and organizing the barrage of "messages" that flow through a complex network of elite, mass, and interpersonal communication that makes up the world's communication system. An individual listening to a conversation about recent events in Viet Nam or the report of a recently returned visitor from Czechoslovakia; reading a newspaper story of the day's events in the United Nations; watching a TV special about an international crisis; listening to a lecture on recent developments in the chemistry of human learning --- is functioning as an observer of the current history of the world system.

Fifth, individuals are policy analysts and critics. As an intellectual operation the process of analyzing and judging the policies or actions of organized groups within the world system (particularly the foreign policy decisions and actions of national governments) appears to involve a complex blending of knowledge, analytical skill, evaluation, and observation combined with a capacity for judgment in the face of normally incomplete information and future uncertainty. To reject a proposal to intensify air raids on the grounds that it would be unwise for the United States to escalate the war in Viet Nam because of likely countermoves on the part of China; to deem impractical a proposed increase in foreign aid because such a move would not command sufficient public support; to argue for an extension of the nuclear test ban treaty on the grounds that resumption of surface testing would be detrimental to the health of the human species --- is to function in the role of policy analyst and critic.

Sixth, individuals are actors in the international social system. To be a soldier in a national military force abroad; to be a student studying abroad; to interact with non-Americans in social or business situations; to travel abroad as a tourist; to buy (or refuse to buy) consumer products from abroad (e.g. Polish ham, French wines, or Soviet caviar); to be a representative of one's national government in international transactions --- are a few examples of the multiplicity of ways in which individuals function as actors withing the world system.

Each of these "roles" can be performed with varying degrees of competence. Individuals can be more or less sophisticated in their understandings; they can be more or less skillful in making analytical judgments, and so on. The competence with which an individual performs these roles would seem to be a function of the capabilities or capacities he brings to the role in much the same sense that the quality of an actor's performance is a function of the abilities he brings to his role within a play or movie.

What are the defining characteristics of competency? That is, in respect to each of these roles what qualities or characteristics distinguish the internationally competent citizen from the internationally incompetent citizen? Through an examination of the extent literature combined with conversations with several social scientists and educators I have endeavored to construct a partial profile or model of the internationally competent citizen. It is partial in the sense that clearly the profile does not capture all of the qualities that might be legitimately associated with competency, but hopefully the model serves to point up a selected number of qualities or characteristics that are particularly salient in considering the contribution which the K-12 curriculum can and should make to the international education of children and adolescents.

Individuals as the Possessors of Knowledge and Understanding of the World System

Looked at from the standpoint of being the possessor of knowledge about and understanding of the world system, what are the distinguishing characteristics of the internationally competent citizen?

First, there appears to be widespread agreement that the internationally competent citizen possess a conceptual understanding of various phenomena within the world system. This is to say, his understanding of the system is in the form of an expanding fund of both increasingly abstract and increasingly detailed conceptualizations of the system and its component phenomena. This can be contrasted to understanding in the form of a body of memorized factual information. Needless to say, these two kinds of "understandings" are not mutually exclusive. A person developing an increasingly complex and rich body of conceptual understandings of given phenomena will also acquire an accumulating fund of more or less specific factual information about those phenomena. However, as so much of the "new social studies" literature points out, the converse can be true. That is, individuals can learn facts without a corresponding expansion in the abstractness, complexity or richness of their conceptual understanding.

Another way of putting this point is to say that the internationally competent citizen possesses the capacity to think conceptually about various phenomena within the world system. This is to say, he perceives or visualizes any phenomenon in two ways. He is capable of viewing it as one instance or one member of a more general (hence abstract) class or population of analytically comparable phenomena, and he is also capable of distinguishing between particular phenomenon falling within the general class. For example, a student who can think conceptually about the American revolution can think of the American revolution as one instance of a more general phenomena called revolution. He can, in short, perceive the American revolution as one member of a large population of revolutions. At an even more abstract level he can think of revolution (including the American revolution) as a sub-class of a more general phenomena called political change. At the same time he locates the American revolution as one member of a population of events called revolutions, the student can discriminate the American revolution from the French, British, Mexican, Cuban, etc., revolutions.

Second, the internationally competent citizen possesses a global understanding of the world system and its component phenomena. By this I mean an understanding of the whole in contrast to simply a discrete understanding of the parts that comprise the whole. The meaning of this, and its implications for teaching, are easily illustrated by looking at the kind of understanding one seeks to develop in teaching about American society. In a course in American history one might teach about Congress, about courts, about the frontier, about differences between various geographical regions --- in a word, about a hundred and one things. Except in the most extreme of "fact oriented" classrooms the development of a fund of knowledge about particular objects within American society is not taken as the sole end of instuction. One does not, for example, have students compare the geography of the Great Plains and the geography of the Southeast simply to generate knowledge about these regions as separate entities. A teacher's objective in this case may be multiple. For instance, he may seek to develop an understanding of a given concept from geography or a given inquiry skill, but clearly one of the purposes behind having students study the two regions is to develop their understanding of the whole of which the regions are parts; in a word, to develop their understanding of American society as a society. Or, to put the point a bit differently, the teacher is not simply seeking to develop the students' knowledge of particular differences between particular regions. Rather, he is seeking to expand students' understanding of regional variations as one feature or characteristic of the structure of American society. In the case of the world, it is a comparable kind of understanding of the world system perceived as a totality that characterizes the internationally competent citizen.

Perhaps I can illustrate what I have in mind by a global understanding in this way. A student who has developed some global understanding of world economics does not simply perceive the world in terms of there being some rich nations and many poor nations; he can visualize the matter in terms of the global distribution of the world's wealth. He can, in short, think of such a thing as the "world's total wealth" and visualize that wealth as being unevenly distributed among the human species. A student who can think globally about the world system does not simply think of trade between the U.S. and Britain, or trade between the Soviet Union and Italy, etc., but can visualize these as particular elements in the overall global trading system. A student who can globally think of the world system does not simply know that different groups within the world speak different languages, he can also visualize the human species as a linguistically diverse species.

Third, the internationally competent citizen possesses a conceptually complex comparative understanding of the world system and its component phenomena. "Comparative understanding" implies a conceptual understanding in the sense discussed above. That is, it is a capacity to perceive, to think of, or to imagine any given phenomenon (be it a particular event, a particular social system, a particular biological species, a particular action, a particular planet, etc.) As one instance of a much larger population of analytically comparable events, social systems, etc., that can be compared with one another. For instance, it means the capacity to think of the migration of Europeans to America as one instance, or one example, or one case study, of the general phenomena of human migration. For example, a student who can think comparatively about the European migration can (if provided the necessary information) note similarities and differences between the migration of Europeans to North and South America and the earlier migration of Asiatic peoples to North and South America. More broadly a capacity to think comparatively implies a capacity to think of the world system as one of what are very likely thousands of analytical comparable systems scattered about the universe; a capacity to think of mankind as one form of life in a much larger system of life, a capacity to think of the global social system as a system which can be compared with human social systems at the subplanetary level.

I use the adjective "conceptually complex" comparative understanding to refer to three particular kinds of capacities. One, is an awareness of the fact that any two or more things are not entirely alike or entirely different. Conceptual complexity implies an ability to perceive any two or more objects of comparison as being both alike and different at the same time. This point is succinctly made by Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry A. Murray: "Every man is in certain respects

a. like all other men
b. like some other men
c. like no other man." (31)

What is true of individuals is also true of the other units of analysis in the social sciences - - - societies, social systems, cultural systems, historical events, historical eras, etc. For example the American revolution is like all revolutions in some respects, like some others but not all other revolutions in still other respects, and in still other respects a unique historical experience. Or, American society shares some characteristics with all human societies; other characteristics with some but not all other human societies; and it possesses some attributes which are uniquely American.

Two, conceptual sophistication implies an awareness of the influence of sampling on one's relative perception of difference and similarities. For instance, in the context of a fourth grade classroom, a teacher might tend to see more difference than similarities between the two fourth grade students. But were the sample of observations expanded to include all elementary school children, her perception may reverse, and she would tend to see more similarities than differences between the two fourth grade children. Similarly, in looking at nations in the modern world a sample that included only the United States and the Soviet Union might lead observers to emphasize the differences between the two societies, and to play down similarities, but were the sample to be expanded to include Chad, Burma, Haiti, and India, an observer might conclude that the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. as highly developed, industrial societies are very much alike in many respects when compred to the less developed nations of the world.

Three, conceptual sophistication implies a capacity to view most differences as a matter of degree rather than of kind. For example, the internationally competent citizen does not think of political systems as being either democratic or not democratic; of economic systems as being either industrialized or non-industrialized; of societies being either modern or not modern, etc. Rather, he is capable of seeing these (and most attributes in terms of which most phenomena are described and differences noted) as complex properties which different units can possess in varying degrees. For instance, he can think of the world's national political systems as arranged along a graduated continuum from those that are highly democratic to those that are highly non-democratic.

Individuals as the Makers of Analytical Judgments

As indicated above, by analytic judgments I have in mind judgments about the nature of reality or fact; assertions about what is true or not true. They are, in short, judgments about the validity of empirical beliefs. Needless to say, all of us make innumerable analytic judgments every day. We do so for the simple reason that to believe is to make choices. Every belief (every image of any phenomena) represents a choice from among alternative beliefs. To believe that the planet's shape is round is to choose from among alternative beliefs, e.g., it is flat, it is cube, etc. To believe that economic development involves cultural change is to make a choice from among possible alternative beliefs, e.g., economic development is simply a matter of imparting technological and managerial skills into a society, etc.

Viewing individuals as the makers of analytical judgments, what are the defining characteristics of the internationally competent citizen? There is massive volume of commentary dealing with analysis or inquiry within elementary and secondary schools. An examination of this literature suggests that we might usefully view the schools as making two major (and related) kinds of contributions to the development of students' capacity to make what might be termed a "realistic" attitude toward knowledge and the other is the development of some understanding of and skill in the process of social scientific inquiry.

In respect to the first of these matters, that is attitude toward knowledge, it would seem that the internationally competent citizen possesses at least three capabilities. One, he is able to perceive or think of human knowledge in any area or in respect to any phenomena as a corpus of man-created images or hypotheses which is subject to continuous change through the processes of (a) abandoning or discarding traditional beliefs, (b) redefining or reformulating traditional beliefs, and (c) creating new beliefs. Closely linked to the cognitive ability to perceive or think of knowledge in this way is an emotional capacity to live with tentativeness or the absence of finality or certainty, and a tolerance of ambiguity about what constitutes warranted or unwarranted beliefs.

Two, the internationally competent citizen is aware of the fact that any phenomena can be conceptualized in a multiplicity of ways. For example, a phenomena like violence can be analyzed from several perspectives, e.g., in terms of the biology, the psychology, or the sociology of violence. As a result, surrounding any phenomena there can be many different kinds of beliefs which provide alternative but not necessarily conflicting images of the phenomena in question. In short, the internationally competent citizen realizes that the problem of human knowledge in general is like the knowledge problem faced by the blind men who sought to describe an elephant from information about the shape of different parts. Because of his awareness of the problem of perspective, the internationally competent citizen is capable of entertaining alternative conceptualizations and of exploring alternative frames of reference or models of analysis in examining any phenomenon. For example, an internationally competent citizen is able to think about a phenomenon such as sacred cows in India from more than one perspective. He might, for instance, be able to think about sacred cows within the context of Hindu theology, within the context of the cultural history of India, within the context of the manifest and latent functions performed by the custom in different social systems within Indian society, and within the context of India's food problem.

Third, and related to the last point, the internationally competent citizen has some awareness of the sociology of knowledge, an ability to perceive that perceptions and interpretations of the world are conditioned by the culture and social situation of the observer.

The second dimension of analytical competence consists of some conceptual understanding of and skill in the process of social scientific inquiry. An understanding of the process of inquiry would seem to entail the development of some understanding of:

1. The nature of analytical problems or questions in the social sciences.

2. The nature of and types of propositions or hypothesis found in the social sciences.

3. The nature of concepts and variables.

4. The logic and methodology of sampling.

5. The logic of measurement and the methods of data collection in the social sciences.

6. The logic of evidence in social inquiry.

7. The nature and uses of theory in social inquiry.

The development of skills in social inquiry seem to imply the development of the following kind of abilities or capacities.

1. An ability to distinguish statements expressing descriptive beliefs, explanatory beliefs, predictive beliefs, and normative beliefs.
2. An ability to identify and formulate in question form analytical problems inherent in a set of data or in an argument about a given phenomena and to critically appraise these formulations.
3. An ability to identify alternative beliefs about a given phenomena and to state these beliefs in the form of explicit propositions or hypotheses.
4. An ability to recognize and to explicate the logical implications of hypotheses.
5. An ability to identify the concepts that must be defined and the variables that must be "measured" in order to empirically test propositions or hypotheses.
6. An ability to conceptually define these concepts and to think of or "invent" ways in which variables might be measured.
7. An ability to critically examine conceptual definitions and operational measures.
8. An ability to identify the kind and form of information or data that a test of propositions calls for; that is, the kind and form of data implied by proposed operational measures of variables.
9. An ability to collect, organize and to evaluate data in terms of their apparent validity and reliability.
10. An ability to evaluate hypotheses or propositions in light of data and then to accordingly reject them, modify them, or accept them.
11. An ability to relate two or more propositions together to form a "theory."
12. An ability to recognize or identify the logical implications of a theory.
13. An ability to judge or evaluate the merits of alternative theories.

Individuals as the Makers of Normative Judgments

Normative judgements, or evaluations, are claims about the goodness or badness, the desirability or undesirability, the appropriateness or the inappropriateness of given phenomena.

Normative judgments would appear to contain two major elements. One of these can be termed value claims (or value judgments), and the other performance claims (or appraisals). The first of these consists of assertions about the qualities, characteristics, or properties in terms of which a given phenomenon is to be judged, apparaised, or evaluated., The second element is assertions that a given phenomenon does or does not possess or exhibit the desired qualities, characteristics, or properties. For example, the assertion that "Mary X would not make a good wife because she cannot cook," is a normative judgment. It consists on the one hand of the value claim that women as prospective wives are to be judged as good or bad bets in terms of the quality "ability to cook," and on the other hand, it contains the appraisal that Mary X lacks this essential quality. To take a somewhat more complex illustration: "Nation-states are historically outmoded forms of political organization because they cannot under conditions imposed by modern weapons technology provide a high level of security from violence." The value claim in this judgment consists of the assertion that nation-states no longer possess this valued quality, that is, they cannot provide a high level of security from violence.

Viewing individuals as the makers of normative judgments, what are the defining characteristics of the internationally competent citizen? First, the internationally competent citizen is emotionally capable of making relatively rational normative judgments. This seems to be a primary thrust of what is sometimes referred to as the "mental hygiene" approach to education for international understanding. The emphasis is upon the cultivation of mentally or emotionally healthy individuals who are psychologically free to perceive and hence to evaluate the world around them with a modicum of objectivity or rationality. Rationality, or more accurately rational judgments, in this context would seem to mean judgments characterized by emotional or cathetic commitments congruent with the values that a person or group is seeking to realize. An evaluation is non-rational to the degree that it involves an emotional commitment to a course of action, to an institution, to a policy, etc., which is either unrelated to the values being sought or is actually destrructive of these values. In short, rational evaluations are evaluations grounded on the one hand in a clear image of the values a person seeks to realize, and on the other hand, in an accurate perception of reality. In contrast, non-rational evaluations are grounded in a false consciousness of the values that are most important to the person, and/or false perceptions of reality. Non-rational evaluations tend to derive from efforts to satisfy one's personality needs, or from one's desire to comply with the opinions dominant in important reference groups. In a word, to judge something good or bad because such judgment satisfies one or more ego needs, or to judge it good or bad because the judgment complies with the opinion of important reference groups, is to evaluate non-rationally. In contrast, to judge something good or bad because there is "good reason" to believe that it is supportive or destructive of specified values, even though the judgment fails to comply with what one wishes were the case or with what one's reference groups deem to be true, is to evaluate rationally.

Two, the internationally competent citizen is capable of analyzing normative conflicts in terms of the sources of disagreement that give rise to the conflict in question. This would seem to imply an ability to distinguish semantic sources of disagreement (i.e., disagreement generated by different usages or meanings of words), empirical sources of conflict (i.e., conflict arising from divergent perceptions of reality), and value conflicts (i.e., conflict arising from differences in value claims and differences in the values or qualities in terms of which a given phenomenon is to be judged). For example, in the context of international education a student who had developed a capacity to analyze normative arguments in terms of the sources of conflict would be able to discriminate between the following kinds of disagreements.

A claims:	U.S. withdrawal from Viet Nam would substantially increase the probability of World War III.
B counter claims:	U.S. withdrawal from Viet Nam would decrease the likelihood of World War III.

. . . .

C claims:	Nation X is more democratic than Nation Y because Nation X has had more free elections.
D counter claims	Nation X cannot be more democratic than Nation Y because Nation X has no social welfare programs.

. . . .

E claims:	It is important to increase spending for space exploration because if we don't the Soviet Union will out run us in the space race.
F counter claims:	It is important to reduce space spending so as to have more money for an attack upon human problems in urban areas.

The disagreement between A & B reflects different perceptions of reality. In the second instance C & D are in disagreement because of different definitions or conceptions of what "democracy" implies. In the last case, E & F disagree because of differences in the values in terms of which the space program is to be appraised (or at least a difference in the priority assigned to different values).

Three, the internationally competent citizen is capable of making explicit evaluations or reflective judgments. Explicit evaluations can be defined as evaluations:

(1) Characterized by an explicit specification of the values, criteria or standards in terms of which specified phenomena are to be judged good or bad, desirable or undesirable, etc.

(2) Characterized by the specification of behavioral definitions or observable indications of these values or criteria.

(3) Characterized by the specifications of means by which the necessary information or data needed for judgment can be obtained.

Charles McClelland illustrates what the process of explicit evaluation might look like with a scenario that depicts a classroom of the future in which teacher and students have access to a computerized information storage and retrieval system.

Student: "Do you think the Russians are better than the Chinese?"

Teacher: "In what way? What do you mean when you ask, are they better?"

S: "Well, do the Russians make more good things for the people--like cars, movies, refrigerators? Maybe Russians have more good things to eat?"

T: "Make a list of what all you think are 'good things;' let me go over your list and then you can ask the computer for information."

Computer: "The data requested are as follows. . . ."

S: (Studying the printout) "See, the Russians are better."

T: "Yes; but you still didn't check to see how much better. You didn't think to find out how many people there are in each country, how much income they receive, who gets what of what you call 'good things,' and whether or not China is making faster progress than Russia in producing the products on your list. Are you sure you think that being able to make and use things like cars would make the Russians better than the Chinese? But first you should get the additional information from the machine. You should write your questions so you can find out what the average person receives in both countries; also try the lowest 25% and the highest 25%. Do you know how to do that? Remember to convert to $ equivalents."

S: "Yes."

C: "The distribution of passenger motor vehicles in the USSR is . . . etc."

S: "I'll have the computer compare all this to the United States. Then I'm going to try to get information on two more things: are Russians happier than the Chinese and do Russians have more freedom than the Chinese? When I do that, I am going to get the facts about happiness and freedom for the United States and Sweden too, just to make it more interesting."

T: "You can't think of any way to show happiness, can you? You can think about that while you finish the comparison for the United States on your products, population, income, and the dollar and per capita problems."

S: "I already know what to try for happiness. I'll use suicides, vacations people take, people in hospitals, murders, divorces, orphans, how long people live on the average, and maybe public opinion polls on what people say they worry about in all four countries. And, for freedom, I can check on elections, voters, churches, newspapers, how many people get to travel to other countries, and things like that."

T: "That's good but you probably will have some problems. Just think about your indicators; you will have to convince me that they really stand for the things you say they stand for."

C: "The requested data are not available as follows. . . ."

S: "I have empty cells for vacations, churches, and polls for the Peoples Republic of China. There are some funny things too in the happiness index for Sweden and the USSE. I think Swedes are happier than the Russians but the picture is mixed up. What do I do now?"

T: "Which are you going to believe--your personal impressions or your findings? You should know by now that interpreting your printouts is the hard part. There are validity problems with all sets of indicators; you will learn in high school how to estimate the probable amount of error in your aggregated data and some ways to correct for it. Do the best you can with what you have now. What are you going to do about your empty cells? You didn't get anything on Chinese vacations. How is that to be explained?"

S: "Our computer just doesn't know that. Or maybe they don't have vacations. Or maybe their government doesn't let out the information. That would be good for the freedom index--if I could find out what information is censored by the government. I guess the Chinese don't have vacations. I'll just drop vacations."

T: "It is possible that there are some data estimates on religion in China. If you want to follow that, I'll approve a question to the central network."

S: "I'll fill out the form."

Later

S: "I have everything completed now to show how Russia is better than China but I don't think I can really decide. Anyway, the program turned out another way when I added the U.S. and Sweden."

T: "Go ahead and write your summary. Keep to the facts that you actually used and don't add a lot of statements about matters that you did not investigate. Show your conclusions but indicate which ones you are sure about and which ones are less reliable, no matter how much you like them. Your choice of the original question was a poor one but I let you go ahead to see if you could correct it. You did fairly well. Next time you program see if you can't make a series of more important and interesting comparisons. Maybe you started on freedom and speech and press for maybe, ten countries in the Atlantic area and see what generalizations about legal restriction can be made for 1900 to the present. I think the computer has all the information you need." (32)

Four, the internationally competent citizen is capable of making "humane" evaluations. I use the term "humane" to refer to a complex set of presumably related quantities frequently mentioned in the international education literature. Humane evaluations are defined as evaluations characterized by:

1. A relative freedom from the influence of egocentric thinking. Egocentric thinking can be defined as thinking proceeding from the assumption that others see the world in the same way that I see it. Thus, if I perceive my actions (or those of some group to which I belong) to be good, peaceful, generous, benevolent, etc., others must see the same qualities in these actions. For example, if one sees American foreign aid as an expression of American benevolence and concern, and is egocentric in his thinking, he unreflectively assumes that his perception of American aid is the only possible perception and, hence, the recipient of the aid will also perceive it as an expression of benevolence and concern. Hence, the recipient can be expected to reciprocate with expressions of gratitude. When recipients fail to do this, they must be judged ingrates suffering from a moral deficiency, and not deserving of continued solicitude.

2. A relative freedom from ethnocentric thinking. Ethnocentric thinking is closely related to egocentric thinking, and is probably indistinguishable from it in most situations. Ethnocentrism is the tendency to think of the actions, customs, institutions, ideologies, etc., of the particular groups to which one belongs as superior to the actions, institutions, etc., of outside groups. Herodotus provides an excellent working definition of ethnocentrism in observing that:

> . . . if one were to offer men to choose out of all the customs in the world such as seemed to them best, they would examine the whole number, and end by preferring their own; so convinced are they that their own usages far surpass those of all others. . . ."

3. A relative freedom from stereotypic thinking. Stereotypic thinking can be defined as thinking which is dominated by the use of universal and closed generalizations about or characterizations of some group, process, social institution, culture, ideology, etc.

4. "Dimensionally complex" comparisons. Normative judgments reflecting "dimensionally complex" comparisons are evaluations that reflect an awareness of the fact that any phenomenon of any complexity can (and normally should be) judged by not one but many standards, and that a phenomenon so judged can be judged "good" in some respects and "bad" in other respects. Thus the United States may be judged inferior to several other societies in some respects (e.g., a relatively high rate of infant mortality compared with several European nations) and be judged comparatively superior to other societies in still other respects (i.e., a high level of agricultural productivity).

5. Empathic thinking. Empathy can be generally defined as a capacity to "step into another's shoes" and accordingly perceive of the world as others view it. It is an ability to sympathetically imagine how an action, an institution, an event, etc., appears to other persons who look at the phenomena from a cultural

or situational context different from one's own. Evaluations characterized by empathy would seem to be generally identifiable by the absence of ridicule and of assumptions of stupidity and/or immorality on the part of the individuals or groups whose actions, institutions, beliefs, etc., are being evaluated.

6. "World-minded" thinking. By "world-minded" thinking I have in mind a general perception of and value orientation toward the world that proceeds from a world view of the problems of humanity. It is an ability to identify with mankind in general rather than simply one's own national, racial, religious groups, etc., in judging international phenomena.

Individuals as Foreign Policy Analysts and Critics

In a great many respects the contemporary international political system is substantially different from the classical nation-state system of the 18th and 19th Centuries. However, nation-states continue to be major centers of decision making within the inter-national system, and hence one of the major ways in which individuals participate in the international system are as analysts and critics of the foreign policy decisions of their own national governments. What are the distinguishing characteristics of the internationally competent citizen viewed as a policy analyst and critic? While there is not a great deal of literature found explicitly on this matter, a couple of points seem to stand out.

First, the internationally competent citizen possesses some knowledge of how foreign policy decisions are made. He has, in short, some understanding of the structure and process of foreign poligy decision-making, particularly within his own nation.

Second, the internationally competent citizen is able to analyze foreign policy decisions in terms of the major factors operating within the decisional process, and to make judgments about particular decisions (actual or proposed) in light to these factors. This would appear to imply an ability to analyze and to judge decisions in terms of the following kinds of questions:

1. Will this decision really help attain my country's goals?

2. Will this decision work out well, given other nations' goals and possible actions?

3. Do we have the resources to carry out this action in wealth, war-power, other nations' support, etc.?

4. Does this action fit the economic situation of my nation and its allies?

5. Will the politicians and public support this action??

6. Will this action create important military risks for us and our allies?

7. Will this line of action seriously endanger future international cooperation or the welfare of the human race?

8. Is this action realistic, given what is known about the feelings, fears, or attitudes of other countries and their leaders?

9. Is this action moral or immoral in terms of any one of my country's deepest beliefs?

10. Given the situation as analyzed, is this an action where benefits outweigh risks and costs? Does it need to be done at this time?

Individuals as Observers of Current History

In an era of mass communication when virtually all Americans are linked to a worldwide environment through radio, TV, and a massive system of news gathering, one of the major ways in which an individual relates to the world system is as an observer of the system's current history. Viewing individuals in this role, what are the defining characteristics of the internationally competent citizen? There are at least three qualities that warrant attention.

First, the internationally competent citizen possesses an interest in current events; that is, he has the motivation to seek out information about the current history of his world.

Second, the internationally competent citizen possesses the vocabulary and conceptual understandings necessary to follow current events through the news media, TV specials, and in semi-scholarly commentary in newspapers and magazines.

Third, the internationally competent citizen possesses some knowledge and understanding of the communication system that links him to events, developments, decisions, etc., occurring in his international environment. This would seem to include some understanding of how "the news" is collected and processed by the news services, newspapers, and radio and TV stations; some knowledge of how the type of media influences the content of the "the news"; and some knowledge of the situational, sociological, and psychological factors which influence what "news" an individual is exposed to and how he reacts to it.

Individuals as Actors

Individuals relate to the world system in all the ways just discussed. In addition they are actors within the system. Viewing individuals from this perspective, what qualities are evidenced by or in the actions of internationally competent citizens?

If asked of any sample of educators or social scientists this question will yield a wide variety of responses. I suspect, however, that most of us would note in one way or another five general points. To begin with, the internationally competent citizen evidences in his interaction and relation with others a sensitivity to and a tolerance if not positive acceptance of cultural diversity. Minimally, this would seem to mean that he does not through ignorance or indifference act so as to deprecate or ridicule individuals or groups culturally different from himself. In a word he evidences a respect for the customs, beliefs, and life styles of others. And beyond the level of simple tolerance the internationally competent citizen evidences in his actions a "cosmopolitan enjoyment" of cultural diversity.

Secondly, the actions of the internationally competent citizen evidence a capacity to emotionally and intellectually cope with change. This would seem to include: (a) a perception of change as a natural or inevitable feature of the human condition; (b) a capacity to think of change in terms of its systemic causes and effects; and (c) an openness to or pro-attitude toward change combined with a sensitivity to the social and psychological costs of change and a supportive attitude toward efforts designed to compensate the "victims" of change.

Third, the internationally competent citizen evidences in his actions a sensitivity to and acceptance of the "foreign policy implications" of mankind's growing interdependence. For Americans particularly this would seem to imply on the one hand a recognition of the limits of national power and on the other hand an acceptance of an obligation to assist in the economic development of the developing two-thirds of mankind.

Fourth, the internationally competent citizen evidences by his actions multiple group loyalties. He does not feel that any one group within mankind (whether it be a nation, a race, a religion, a "civilization." a socio-economic class, etc.) can legitimately command a monopoly of obligation, loyalty, or identification. He perceives himself as being a morally responsible member of many human groups at the national, sub-national, and supra-national levels of human social organization. Intimately linked to the ability to perceive oneself as a responsible member of many human groups is an emotional capacity to tolerate a relatively high level of ethical or moral ambiguity and inter-role conflict.

Fifth, the internationally competent citizen evidences a capacity to emotionally tolerate continued conflict and tension within national and international communities. Rather than eliminating human tension and conflict, the increasing interdependence of the human species is very likely to lead to increased tension and conflict. Thus, it would seem that one of the characteristics of the internationally competent citizen is a capacity to act with restraint in the face of tension and conflict.

Summary --- In this part of the essay I have endeavored to deal with the question of what are the qualities or characteristics which distinguish or define the internationally competent citizen.

I approached this question by first suggesting that individuals occupy six major kinds of roles in relation to the world system. Then on the basis of a review of existing literature along with the conversations I have had with educators and social scientists I attempted to specify for each "role" what seemed to be judged to the major qualities, characteristics, or capacities that distinguish the internationally competent citizen from the less competent citizen. In this way I endeavored to sketch out in cursory form a model or ideal type of the internationally competent citizen. Needless to say, few if any human beings attain all the virtues prescribed by the model but hopefully it serves to partially portray the range of qualities which we ought to seek to develop within students in our schools and universities as well as within ourselves.

III

A TYPOLOGY OF CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES

This essay began with the question: What contributions can and should the schools make to the international education of children and young people? I have endeavored in the past several pages to sketch out one possible answer to this question. In conclusion, I will try to summarize what has been argued in the form of a typology setting forth what I perceive to be the major kinds of contributions that the K-12 curriculum should seek to make to contemporary students' international understanding.

I. The K-11 curriculum should develop students' knowledge and cognitive understanding of the world system. This implies:

  A. The curriculum should develop students' understanding of the earth as a planet. This implies:

    1. Developing some comprehension of the place of the world system in cosmic space and time. This implies:

      a. Some understanding of the location of the earth in the cosmic system.

      b. Some understanding of the cosmological and geological histories of the planet.

      c. Some understanding of the differences and similarities between the earth and other planets (actual and imagined).

    2. Developing some understanding of the earth as a set of physical systems that both condition and are conditioned by living systems and particularly man. This implies:

      a. Some understanding of the planet's contemporary geography and geology with special emphasis upon an understanding of the interactions between the planet's physical characteristics and the evolution of life and particularly man's bio-cultural development.

B. The curriculum should develop students' understanding of mankind as a species of life. This implies:

   1. Developing a comparative understanding of man as one of many living systems. This implies:

      a. Some understanding of similarities and differences between living and non-living systems.

      b. Some understanding of similarities and differences between man and other living systems.

   2. Developing an understanding of basic human commonalities. This implies:

      a. Some understanding of man's common biological needs.

      b. Some understanding of man's common psychological needs.

      c. Some understanding of the functional needs of human socities and their component social and cultural systems.

      d. Some understanding of similarities, anologies, or parallels in the historical experience of different groups.

   3. Developing an understanding of the sources of differences in human actions and life styles. This implies:

      a. Some understanding of human behaviors as being socially learned and culturally conditioned.

   4. Developing some understandings of basic human behavior and social activities that are grounded in the behavioral sciences. This implies:

      a. Some behavioral science based understanding of particular human behaviors.

      b. Some understanding of human beings as biological systems, as personality systems, as actors in social systems, as "products" of cultural systems, and as participants in systems of natural ecology.

5. Developing some understanding of major structural characteristics of the human species. This implies the development of some understanding of the pheononia summarized by the folowing kinds of generalizations.

   a. The human species is a racially diverse species.

   b. The human species is a linguistically diverse species.

   c. The human species is a culturally diverse species.

   d. The human species is an institutionally diverse species.

   e. The human species is generally an economically depressed species but with vast disparities in the wealth, education, health, etc. enjoyed by its members.

   f. The human species is a politically uncentralized (or stateless) species.

   g. The human species is demographically a rapidly expanding species.

   h. The human species is an increasingly urbanized species.

   i. The human species is an increasingly violent species.

   j. The human species is an increasingly industrialized (mechanized) species.

   k. The human species is an increasingly interdependent species.

6. Developing some "species centered" or "globally focused" understanding of major events, trends, transformations, etc. in man's biological evolution and socio-cultural development.

7. Developing some understanding of the process and dynamics of socio-cultural change within particular societies and within the human species in general.

C. The curriculum should develop students' understanding of the international or global social system as one level of human social organization. This implies:

1. Developing some understanding of the major entities that comprise the contemporary international system. This implies:

    a. Some comparative understanding of the modern world's some 130 nation-states.

    b. Some functionally oriented understanding of cross-national organizations both governmental and non-governmental.

    c. Some understnading of the international status of the planet's polar regions, its oceans, and outer space.

2. Developing some historical understanding of the nation-state system as one of many historical and imaginable forms of politically organizing the human species.

3. Developing some understanding of major social processes within the international system. this implies:

    a. Some understanding of inter-nation conflict and conflict resolution.

    b. Some understanding of inter-nation war.

    c. Some understanding of inter-nation collaboration and integration.

    d. Some understanding of inter-nation communications and transportation.

    e. Some understanding of inter-nation trade, investment, and foreign aid.

    f. Some understanding of cultural diffusion.

    g. Some understanding of the processes of inter-nation influences or power.

4. Developing some understanding of major international social problems. This implies:

    a. Some understanding of the problems of controlling or managing inter-group, particularly inter-nation, violence and of creating institutions for the peaceful resolution of conflict.

b. Some understanding of the problem of controlling population growth.

c. Some understanding of the problems of "modernizing" developing societies.

d. Some understanding of the problems of controlling the social and psychological costs of rapid socio-cultural change, particularly technological change, urbanization, and the bureaucratization of social organizations.

e. Some understanding of the problems of controlling further deterioration in man's natural environments.

f. Some understanding of the problem of exploiting the resources of the world's oceans and outer-space for the welfare of mankind in general.

II. The K-12 curriculum should develop the capacity of students to view the world system as a whole and particular phenomana within it conceptually, comparatively, and globally. This implies:

A. The curriculum should develop within students a perceptual or cognitive capacity to see or to think of empirically concrete or historically specific phenomena (events, institutions, actions, etc.) as particular instances or cases within a larger class of analytically comparable phenomana.

B. The curriculum should develop within students an ability to compare two or more phenomena in a conceptually sophisticated way. This implies:

1. An ability to perceive of two or more objects being compared in terms of both similarities and differences.
2. An ability to recognize that one's relative perception of similarities and differences is influenced by the size and nature of the sample of objects being compared.
3. An ability to think of differences as matters of degree rather than simply kind.

C. The curriculum should develop within students a capacity to think of or imagine the world as a totality and to perceive particular phenomena wholistically or within a global frame of reference. This implies:

1. Developing a comprehension of the interrelatedness of the human species qua species.

2. Developing a comprehension of the interrelatedness of man as a system of life and the planet earth as a set of interrelated physical systems.

3. Developing a comprehension of the world system as one sub-system within the larger cosmic system.

III. The K-12 curriculum should develop the capacity of students to make logically valid and empirically grounded analytical judgments. This implies:

A. The curriculum should develop within students a "realistic" attitude toward knowledge. This implies:

1. Developing within students an understanding of knowledge as a set of man-created hypotheses or images.

2. Developing within students the capacity to conceptualize phenomena in alternative ways.

3. Developing within students awareness of the influence of cultural setting and social situation on human knowledge, and particularly their own perception and interpretation of the world.

B. The curriculum should develop within students an understanding of and some skill in the process of social scientific inquiry. This implies:

1. Developing within students some understanding of the process of inquiry. This implies developing students' understanding of:

a. The nature of analytical problems or questions in the social sciences.

b. The nature of and types of propositions and hypotheses found in the social sciences.

   c. The nature of concepts and variables.

   d. The logic of measurement and the methodologies of data or information acquisition in the social sciences.

   e. The logic and methodology of sampling.

   f. The logic of evidence in social inquiry.

   g. The nature and uses of theory in social inquiry.

2. Developing students' inquiry skills. Included are:

   a. An ability to distinguish statements expressing descriptive beliefs, explanatory beliefs, predictive beliefs, and normative beliefs.

   b. An ability to identify and formulate in question form analytical problems inherent in a set of data or in an argument about a given phenomena and to critically appraise these formulations.

   c. An ability to identify alternative beliefs about a given phenomena and to state these beliefs in the form of explicit propositions or hypotheses.

   d. An ability to recognize and to explicate the logical implication of hypotheses.

   e. An ability to identify the concepts that must be defined and the variables that must be "measured" in order to empirically test propositions or hypotheses.

   f. An ability to conceptually define these concepts and to think of or "invent" ways in which variables might be measured.

   g. An ability to critically examine conceptual definitions and operational measures.

   h. An ability to identify the kind and form of information or data that a test of propositions calls for; that is, the kind and form of data implied by proposed operational measures of variables.

i. An ability to identify and to evaluate possible sources of data.

j. An ability to collect, organize and to evaluate data in terms of their apparent validity and reliability.

k. An ability to evaluate hypotheses or propositions in light of data and then to accordingly reject them, accept them, or modify them.

l. An ability to relate two or more propositions together to form a "theory".

m. An ability to recognize or identify the logical implications of a theory.

n. An ability to judge or evaluate the merits of alternative theories.

IV. The K-12 curriculum should develop the capacity of students to make rational, analytical, explicit and humane normative judgments or evaluations.

A. The development of a capacity to make rational evaluations implies:

1. The curriculum should seek to develop individuals who are relatively free psychologically to hold attitudes independent of personality needs and group norms.

B. The development of a capacity to make analytical evaluations implies:

1. The curriculum should develop the capacity or students to analyze normative disagreements in terms of semantic, perceptual, and valuational sources of conflict.

C. The development of a capacity to make explicit evaluations implies:

1. The curriculum should develop the capacity of students to explicitly articulate values in terms of which they believe given phenomena should be judged.

2. The curriculum should develop the ability of students to explicitly consider operational or behavioral meaning of values in terms of which judgments are to be made.

3. The curriculum should develop the capacity of students to explicitly consider the information that is needed to reach sound judgments about whether a given object does or does not possess the desired value qualities.

D. The development of a capacity to make humane evaluations implies:

1. The curriculum should develop within students modes of thinking that are relatively free from the influence of egocentric perceptions.

2. The curriculum should develop within students modes of thinking that are relatively free from the influence of ethnocentric perception.

3. The curriculum should develop within students modes of thinking that are relatively free from the influence of stereotypic perceptions.

4. The curriculum should develop within students modes of thinking characterized by moral or ethical complexity.

5. The curriculum should develop within students modes of thinking characterized by a capacity for empathetic understanding.

6. The curriculum should develop within students modes of thinking characterized by a "world-minded" value orientation.

V. The K-12 curriculum should develop the capacity of students to understand and to critically analyze and judge foreign policy decisions. This implies:

A. The curriculum should develop students' knowledge about and conceptual understanding of how foreign policy decisions are made particularly within the American system.

B. The curriculum should develop students' ability to analyze foreign decisions in terms of the major factors operating within the decisional process and to make judgments about particular decisions (actual or proposed) in light of these factors. This implies an ability to analyze and judge decisions in terms of the following kinds of questions:

1. Will this decision really help attain my country's goals?

2. Will this decision work out well, given other nations' goals and possible actions?

3. Do we have the resources to carry out this action in wealth, war-power, other nations' support, etc.?

4. Does this action fit the economic situation of my nation and its allies?

5. Will the politicians and public support this action?

6. Will this action create important military risks for us and our allies?

7. Will this line of action seriously endanger future inter-national cooperation or the welfare of the human race?

8. Is this action realistic, given what is known about the feelings, fears or attitudes of other countries and their leaders?

9. Is this action moral or immoral in terms of any one of my country's deepest beliefs?

10. Given the situation as analyzed is this an action where benefits outweigh risks and costs? Does it need to be done at this time?

VI. The K-12 curriculum should develop students' capacity to intelligently and critically observe current history of the world system. This implies:

A. The curriculum should develop within students an interest in current affairs, that is, a motivation to seek out information about world affairs.

B. The curriculum should develop within students the vocabulary and conceptual understanding needed to follow current events through the mass media, in TV specials, and in semi-scholarly magazines, etc.

C. The curriculum should develop within students an understanding of the structure and functioning of the international communication system that links citizens to events, developments, actions, etc. within their international environment.

VII. The K-12 curriculum should develop the capacity of students to constructively adapt to the "realities of the human condition". This implies.

A. The curriculum should develop students' sensitivity to and emotional acceptance of diversity in human actions, perceptions, cognitions, valuations, and social institutions.

B. The curriculum should develop students' acceptance of and a set of socially responsible attitudes toward technological and socio-cultural changes.

C. The curriculum should develop students' sensitivity to and acceptance of the political and ethical implications of mankind's increasing interdependence.

D. The curriculum should develop students' capacity to experience multiple loyalties, to perceive and feel themselves to be responsible members of sub-national, national and cross-national groups.

E. The curriculum should develop students' capacity to emotionally tolerate the tensions of continued inter-group conflict and hostility.

NOTES

1. For an excellent review and analysis of much of the relevant literature see Ralph H. Hunkins, Education for International Understanding: A Critical Appraisal of the Literature (unpublished Doctor of Education Dissertation, Indiana University, 1968)

2. The concept of incremental and disjointed decision-making is developed in David Braybrooke and Charles C. Lindbloom, A Strategy of Decision (New York: Free Press, 1963)

3. Charles A. McClelland, "Selecting and Processing Information in World Affairs Education," paper prepared for the Foreign Policy Association Study of International Education, April, 1967

4. National Council for the Social Studies, Yearbook, 1954.

5. Percy Bidwell, Undergraduate Education in Foreign Affairs (New York: King's Crown Press, 1962) and Howard and Florence Wilson, American Higher Education and World Afairs, American Council on Education, 1963.

6. Leonard Kenworthy, "Developing World-Minded Teachers," NCSS Yearbook, 1954 and Walter H.C. Laves, "What Does the Citizen Need to Know About World Affairs," Social Education, Vol. XV (October, 1951), pp. 275-278.

7. Grayson Kirk, "Materials for the Study of International Relations," World Politics, April, 1949.

8. James M. Becker and Martha J. Porter, "What is Education for International Understanding?" in Social Education (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, January, 1966).

9. Lewis Paul Todd, The Social Studies and the Social Sciences (New York: Harcourt, Race and World, 1962), p. 284.

10. C.E. Black, The Dynamics of Modernization: A Study of Comparative History (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), p.1

11. Ibid, pp. 1 - 2.

12. Ibid, p. 2

13. For a list and discussion see Hanna's chapter "Society-Child-Curriculum," in C.W. Hunnicutt, Education 2,000 A.D. (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1956,) pp. 165-199.

14. Senator J.W. Fulbright, "What Makes United States Foreign Policy?" The Reporter, vol. 20 (May 14, 1959), p.19.

15. See for example James N. Rosenau, "Foreign Policy as an Issue Area," in Rosenau, ed. The Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy (New York: The Free Press, 1967), pp. 1-50.

16. Robert Harper, "Geography's Role in General Education," Journal of Geography, Vol. 65 (April, 1966), p. 182.

17. Raymond Platig, International Relations Research, (N.Y.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1966), pp. 2-3.

18. Norman Cousins, "Needed: A New World Theme Song," Saturday Review, July, 1968, p. 20.

19. Barbara Ward, Spaceship Earth (N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1966), p. 14. There are many indicators of interdependence that one can point to in substantiating the argument developed here. These include the growth of transnational interactions both public and private. For relevant discussions see K.J. Holsti, International Politics: A Framwork for Analysis (Englewood, Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967), pp. 78-80; Robert C. Angell, "The Growth of Transnational Participation," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 23, 1967, pp. 108-129; The November, 1966, issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science devoted to "Americans Abroad;" and Amitai Etzioni, The Active Society: A Theory of Social and Political Processes (N.Y.: The Free Press, 1968), pp. 556-560. A second indicator would be the growth of cross-national organizations both governmental and non-governmental. See Chadwick Alger, "International Organization and World Order: Social Sciences as a Source of New Perspectives," in James Becker and Howard Mehlinger, eds. International Dimensions in the Social Studies, 38th yearbook for The National Council for the Social Studies), ch. 5. A third indicator is a trend toward increasing homogeneity in human culture and social institutions. Discussions of this matter include: John K. Galbraith, The New Industrial State, (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1967); Wilbert E. Moore, "Global Sociology: The World as a Singular System," and "The Utility of Utopias," in Wilbert E. Moore, Order and Change: Essays in Comparative Sociology, (N.Y.: John Wiley & Sons, 1967); Robert M. Marsh, Comparative Sociology, (N.Y.: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1967) particularly pp. 82-88; Carle C. Zimmerman, "Convergence of the Major Human Family Systems During the Space Age," in Edward A. Tiryakian, ed., Sociological Theory, Values and Socio-Cultural Change, (N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1967); Arnold S. Feldman and Wilbert E. Moore, "Are Industrial Societies Becoming Alike?" in Alvin W. Gouldner and S.M. Miller, eds., Applied Sociology (N.Y.: Glencoe Free Press, 1965) pp. 260-265. A fourth indicator of "global community" is the fact that a great many of man's basic social problems, including the problem of economic well-being and security from violence, are rapidly becoming "internationalized." For a very good general

summary of the many changes that are taking place in the international system see Andrew Scott, The Functioning of the International Political System (N.Y.: The MacMillan Co., 1967).

20. Bruce Russett, Trends in World Politics (N.Y.: The MacMillan Co., 1965), p. 156.

21. Kenneth E. Boulding, "Education for Spaceship Earth," Paper prepared for the Foreign Policy Association Study of International Education, May, 1968.

22. J. David Singer, "The Levels of Analysis Problem in International Relations," in Klaus Knorr and Sidney Verba, eds. The International System: Theoretical Essays, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1961), p. 77.

23. Harper, op.cit.

24. Leften S. Stravrianos, "A Global Perspective on the Organization of World History," in New Perspectives in World History, Thirty-Fourth Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies.

25. Mark Krug, History and the Social Sciences (Walthon, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishers, 1967).

26. For a good summary discussion see Platig, op. cit.

27. The Fenton materials on comparative politics for the ninth grade is the referent.

28. Good examples of comparative studies of international politics and law include: Chadwick Alger, "Comparison of Intranational and International Politics, "American Political Science Review, Vol. LVII, June, 1963, pp. 406-419; Michael Barkun, Law Without Sanctions: Order in Primitive Societies & The World Community, (New Haven, Conn., Yale University Press, 1968); and Raoul Narroll, "Scientific Comparative Politics and International Relations," in R. Barry Farrell, ed., Approaches to Comparative and International Politics, (Evanston, Illinois, Northwestern University Press, 1966), pp. 329-337.

29. Kenneth Boulding, "What Can We Know and Teach about Social Systems," Social Science Education Consortium, Newsletter No. 56, June, 1968), p. 1.

30. Source unknown

31. Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry Murray, "Personality Formation: The Determinante," in Kluckhohn and Murray, eds., Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948), p.35.

32. McClelland, op. cit.

33. This list of factors and questions has been developed by Roger Mastrade of The Foreign Policy Association in connection with a series of simulations and case studies for the study of American foreign policy.

END